

1 Earle C. Cooley
COOLEY, MANION, MOORE & JONES, P.C.
2 21 Custom House Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
3 (617) 737-3100

4 William T. Drescher
23679 Calabasas Road, Suite 338
5 Calabasas, California 91302
(818) 591-0039

6 Attorneys for Defendants
7 CHURCH OF SPIRITUAL TECHNOLOGY and
RELIGIOUS TECHNOLOGY CENTER

8 Eric Lieberman
9 RABINOWITZ, BOUDIN, STANDARD,
KRINSKY & LIEBERMAN, P.C.
10 740 Broadway at Astor Place
New York, New York 10003-9518
11 (212) 254-1111

12 John J. Quinn
QUINN, KULLY AND MORROW
13 520 S. Grand Ave., 8th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
14 (213) 622-0300

15 Laurie J. Bartilson
BOWLES & MOXON
16 6255 Sunset Blvd.,
Suite 2000
17 Los Angeles, CA 90028
(213) 661-4030

18 Attorneys for Defendant
19 CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL

Michael Lee Hertzberg
740 Broadway, Fifth Floor
New York, New York 10003
(212) 982-9870

James H. Berry, Jr.
BERRY & CAHALAN
2049 Century Park East
Suite 2750
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(213) 284-2183

Attorneys for Defendant
AUTHOR SERVICES, INC.

RECEIVED

AUG 30 1991

HUB LAW OFFICES

20
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

22 VICKI J. AZNARAN and) CASE No. CV 88-1786 JMI(Ex)
23 RICHARD N. AZNARAN,)
24 Plaintiffs,) DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO EX PARTE
v.) APPLICATION TO FILE PLAINTIFFS'
25) GENUINE STATEMENT OF ISSUES [SIC]
26 CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF) RE DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS (1) TO EXCLUDE
CALIFORNIA, et al.,) EXPERT TESTIMONY; AND (2) FOR
27 Defendants.) SEPARATE TRIAL ON ISSUES OF
28) RELEASES AND WAIVERS; REQUEST THAT
AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS) OPPOSITIONS BE STRICKEN
DATE: To be determined
TIME: To be determined
COURTROOM: Hon. James M. Ideman

1 Defendants oppose plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application to
2 File Plaintiffs' Oppositions to Defendants' Motion to Exclude
3 Expert Testimony and For Separate Trial on Issues of Releases
4 and Waivers, and request that these late-filed papers be
5 stricken.

6 In defendants' notice of plaintiffs' non-compliance with
7 mandatory pretrial procedures, filed and served on August 9,
8 1991, defendants demonstrated that, throughout this litigation,
9 plaintiffs have engaged in an "unswerving pattern of
10 non-compliance and campaign of delay." [Notice of Non-Compliance
11 at 3]. Defendants therein documented for the Court a pattern by
12 plaintiffs and their counsel of late filings, no filings,
13 incomplete filings, filings that did not comply with the Federal
14 Rules and filings that did not comply with the Local Rules,
15 and the utilization of defendants' former counsel and lawyers
16 associated with defendants' former counsel. Despite the
17 pendency of that Notice, plaintiffs have, yet again, repeated
18 the same contempt for this Court's orders and procedures which
19 they have demonstrated throughout.

20 This Court has already made it clear to plaintiffs that
21 their oppositions to the pending motions were due for filing no
22 later than August 19, 1991. In just this single week,
23 plaintiffs violated this Court's orders and the Local Rules by:

24 (1) Filing oversized oppositions to defendants'
25 two summary judgment motions. These oppositions
26 were numerated to be 40 and 50 pages in length, but
27 were accompanied by a 53-page "Appendix of Fact,"
28

1 thus making the actual size of the two opposition
2 papers 93 and 103 pages;^{1/}

3 (2) Failing to file Statements of Genuine
4 Issues of Fact with their memoranda opposing the
5 summary judgment motions;

6 (3) Attempting to late-file Statements of
7 Genuine Issues of Fact on Friday, August 23, 1991,
8 giving defendants no opportunity to respond to
9 those Statements with defendants' replies, due to
10 be filed on Monday, August 26, 1991;

11 (4) Failing to oppose in a timely fashion four
12 other pending motions;

13 (5) Failing to file a Pretrial Conference
14 Memorandum of Contentions of Fact and Law, due with
15 the Court on August 26, 1991 pursuant to Local Rule
16 9.5; and

17 (6) Preparing all of those papers with the
18 aid of one Gerald Armstrong, who was hired by
19 Joseph Yanny to act as Yanny's paralegal on
20 this very case. [Ex. A, Declaration of Laurie J.
21 Bartilson; Ex. B, Transcript of Hearing of August
22 6, 1991 in Religious Technology Center v.

23
24 1. The Court is reminded that defendants attempted to file
25 moving papers in support of one of the motions at issue that
26 was 103 pages in length, and their ex parte request for
27 permission to do so was denied. That memorandum of points and
28 authorities was accordingly reduced to 49 pages. Had
plaintiffs sought to file a comparably-sized memorandum, no
opposition would have been lodged by defendants. However,
defendants do object to the 93- and 103-page memoranda
submitted by plaintiffs via subterfuge.

1 Yanny, LASC Case No. BC 033035, p. 25].

2 Plaintiffs now seek leave to late-file oppositions to two
3 of the motions which they have failed to oppose. They ask to do
4 so on the very day that defendants' replies to those oppositions
5 would be due for filing with the Court, and on a date only 21
6 days before the scheduled pretrial conference. Plaintiffs,
7 however, can demonstrate no good cause why they continue to
8 refuse to abide by this Court's specific orders and the Local
9 Rules. As such, their ex parte application must be denied,
10 and the lodged oppositions ordered stricken.

11 The burden is on the moving party to demonstrate good
12 cause if he seeks to have more time in which to file papers.
13 Local Rule 1.18. Here, plaintiffs already requested more time,
14 and were granted until August 19, 1991 by this Court. Their
15 request to have until August 26, 1991 to file these very
16 papers was already denied by the Court on August 9, 1991.

17 The moving party is required to present his reasons for
18 seeking the ex parte application, and a memorandum of points
19 and authorities in support thereof. Plaintiffs have done
20 neither. Instead, they offer a declaration of their counsel,
21 which states merely that he and his new co-counsel require more
22 time than the Court was previously willing to give them in order
23 to respond to defendants' motions. Plaintiffs' counsel does
24 not inform the Court, however, that in the preparation of these
25 and other papers, he has been aided by none other than Gerald
26 Armstrong. [Ex. A, Declaration of Laurie J. Bartilson]. Arm-
27 strong is employed by Joseph Yanny as a paralegal on this very
28

1 case. [Ex. B, p. 25]. For him to now have switched his aid
2 to Greene's office further taints all of the papers filed by
3 Greene, and is grounds for disqualification of Greene himself as
4 well. See, In re Complex Asbestos Litigation (1991) 91
5 D.A.R. 8849 (Requiring disqualification of plaintiff's law firm
6 for the hiring of a paralegal formerly employed by defendant's
7 lawyers). Greene's complaint that he has been unable to follow
8 this Court's orders, even with the improper aid of Gerald
9 Armstrong, is thus a completely hollow argument. It is plain
10 that plaintiffs and their counsel have nothing but contempt for
11 this Court, its Rules and its Orders.

12 This is merely the latest episode in plaintiffs'
13 "persistent pattern of abusive conduct," Chism v. National
14 Heritage Life Ins. Company, 637 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir.
15 1981), which defendants and the Court have tried in vain to
16 cure. The schedule set by the Court was clear and concise,
17 plainly designed to permit the Court to rule on pending matters
18 prior to the Pretrial Conference, now set for September 16,
19 1991. Plaintiffs' refusal to comply with this clear order, and
20 instead late-file oppositions willy-nilly, is inexcusable.
21 The language of the Ninth Circuit in dealing with a similar case
22 which arose in this very district is hauntingly appropriate:

23 Chism or his attorneys continually flouted
24 discovery rules, failed to comply with pretrial
25 conference obligations, and repeatedly violated the
26 local rules of court.^{2/} This conduct continued even

27 2. Defendants pointed out in the Notice on August 9, 1991,
28 that plaintiffs' counsel refused to attend the 40-day meeting
of counsel mandated by Local Rule 9.4, which is critical to a
(footnote continued)

1 after a representation to the court that discovery
2 would proceed expeditiously, after a clear warning
3 that the court condemned infractions of the pretrial
4 conference rules, and despite repeated efforts by
5 National to secure compliance without necessity of
6 intervention by the trial court. Plaintiff's
7 misconduct prejudiced his opponent, violated
8 important policies designed to insure efficiency in
9 legal proceedings at the trial court level and
10 persisted to the very end.

11 637 F.2d at 1331.

12 Plaintiffs were given more than adequate time in which to
13 prepare and file timely, appropriately sized, and complete
14 oppositions to defendants' pending motions. The moving papers
15 were filed and served by defendants on July 29, 1991. This
16 Court even granted plaintiffs extra time to prepare their
17 oppositions, despite the close proximity to the pretrial
18 conference date, giving them every possible chance to respond
19 properly. The response of plaintiffs has been, instead, a
20 direct and repeated flouting of the Court's orders.

21 Local Rule 7.3.3 authorizes this Court to strike the
22 attempted filing of any late-filed documents and disregard it
23 for all purposes. The equities of this case cry out for just
24 such a result here. Defendants have complied with the Rules
25 and this Court's orders, suffered irreparable harm while

26 2. (footnote continued)

27 timely completion of pretrial proceedings. Plaintiffs' counsel
28 has still not complied with that rule, and now has also failed
to file a pretrial conference memorandum, or exchange any
witness or exhibit lists.

1 plaintiffs hired defendants' former counsel, and have had their
2 dispositive motions delayed for weeks through plaintiffs'
3 machinations. Plaintiffs and their counsel have, however,
4 disobeyed order after order of this Court, refused to follow
5 the Local or Federal Rules, and commanded the Court to march to
6 their schedule and accept whatever they chose to file, whenever
7 they chose to file it. Plaintiffs cannot - must not - be
8 rewarded for this misconduct. Defendants respectfully urge
9 this Court to examine plaintiffs' conduct, weigh the obvious
10 equities, deny plaintiffs' ex parte application, and strike
11 plaintiffs' late-filed oppositions to defendants' motions.

12 Dated: August 27, 1991

Respectfully submitted,

13 WILLIAM T. DRESCHER


14 Earle C. Cooley
COOLEY, MANION, MOORE
15 & JONES, P.C.

16 Attorneys for Defendants
CHURCH OF SPIRITUAL TECHNOLOGY
17 and RELIGIOUS TECHNOLOGY CENTER

18 Eric Lieberman
RABINOWITZ, BOUDIN, STANDARD,
19 KRINSKY & LIEBERMAN, P.C.

20 John J. Quinn
QUINN, KULLY AND MORROW

21 BOWLES & MOXON

22
23 By: 
Laurie J. Bartilson

24 Attorneys for Defendant
25 CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL

26 MICHAEL LEE HERTZBERG

27 James H. Berry, Jr.
28 BERRY & CAHALAN

Attorneys for Defendant
AUTHOR SERVICES, INC.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

1 DECLARATION OF LAURIE J. BARTILSON

2 I, LAURIE J. BARTILSON, hereby declare and state:

3 1. I am co-counsel of record for plaintiffs in the
4 case of Aznaran v. Church of Scientology of California,
5 et al., Case No. CV 88-1786 JMI(Ex). I have personal
6 knowledge of the matters set forth herein and, if called upon
7 to do so, could and would competently testify thereto.

8 2. On August 19, 1991, I called the offices of Ford
9 Greene, counsel for plaintiffs in this case, to arrange to have
10 a courier pick up several oppositions which plaintiffs were due
11 to file that day.

12 3. The person who answered the telephone in Mr. Greene's
13 office identified himself as Gerald Armstrong. When queried,
14 Armstrong stated that he was at Greene's office "helping out."
15 I know Armstrong, as I attended his deposition in another case
16 in which I am also counsel. He is a long-term litigation
17 adversary of my client, Church of Scientology of California,
18 having been sued for conversion of documents belonging to the
19 Church's Founder.

20 4. I have been informed by private investigators hired by
21 my law firm that Armstrong was present at Ford Greene's offices
22 many times from August 3, 1991 through at least August 21, 1991,
23 often for hours and days at a time. When my courier went to
24 Greene's offices on August 19, 1991 to pick up papers in this
25 case, he observed Armstrong sleeping on the floor in the office.

26 5. Exhibit 1 to the Reply in Support of Defendants'
27 Motion for Summary Judgment is a true and correct copy of
28 a transcript of an August 6, 1991 hearing in the case of

1 Religious Technology Center, et al. v. Yanny, Case No. BC
2 033035. In that case, Yanny was preliminarily enjoined by the
3 Court from representing either the Azarans or Armstrong.

4 I declare under the penalties of perjury under the laws of
5 California and the United States of America that the foregoing
6 is true and correct.

7 Executed this 27th day of August at Los Angeles,
8 California.


9
10
11 
12 LAURIE J. BARTILSON
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT B

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT 41

HON. RAYMOND CARDENAS, JUDGE

RELIGIOUS TECHNOLOGY CENTER, A)
CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT RELIGIOUS)
CORPORATION; CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY)
INTERNATIONAL, A CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT)
RELIGIOUS CORPORATION; AND CHURCH OF)
SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, A)
CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT RELIGIOUS)
CORPORATION,)

PLAINTIFFS,)

VS.)

JOSEPH A. YANNY, AN INDIVIDUAL;)
JOSEPH A. YANNY, A PROFESSIONAL LAW)
CORPORATION; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 25,)
INCLUSIVE,)

DEFENDANTS.)

) SUPERIOR COURT
) CASE NO. BC 033035

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

AUGUST 6, 1991

APPEARANCES:

(AS NOTED ON NEXT PAGE.)

COPY

LINDA STALEY, CSR NO. 3359
OFFICIAL REPORTER

011

APPEARANCES:

FOR PLAINTIFF CHURCH
OF SCIENTOLOGY:

QUINN, KULLY & MORROW
BY: JOHN J. QUINN
520 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE
8TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
(213) 622-0300

FOR PLAINTIFF RELIGIOUS
TECHNOLOGY CENTER:

WILLIAM T. DRESCHER
23679 CALABASAS ROAD
SUITE 338
CALABASAS, CALIFORNIA 91302
(818) 591-0039

FOR DEFENDANT JOSEPH
A. YANNY, INDIVIDUALLY:

CUMMINGS & WHITE
BY: BARRY VAN SICKLE
865 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET
24TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
(213) 614-1000

FOR DEFENDANT JOSEPH
A. YANNY, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION:

JOSEPH A. YANNY
1925 CENTURY PARK EAST
SUITE 1260
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067
(213) 551-2966

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA TUESDAY, 8-6-91 # 9:32 A.M.
2 DEPT. 41 HON. RAYMOND CARDENAS, JUDGE
3 APPEARANCES: (AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.)
4

5 - - O - -
6

7 THE COURT: RELIGIOUS TECHNOLOGY CENTER VERSUS
8 YANNY.

9 THE MATTER IS HERE FOR HEARING ON THE
10 QUESTION OF THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.

11 THE COURT HAS HERETOFORE SIGNED A TEMPORARY
12 RESTRAINING ORDER, JULY 31ST, AND AT THIS TIME, I WILL HAVE
13 THE PARTIES IDENTIFY THEMSELVES AND THEIR APPEARANCE.

14 MR. DRESCHER: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.

15 WILLIAM DRESCHER ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF
16 RELIGIOUS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION.

17 MR. QUINN: JOHN QUINN ON BEHALF OF CHURCH OF
18 SCIENTOLOGY INTERNATIONAL.

19 MR. VAN SICKLE: BARRY VAN SICKLE ON BEHALF OF
20 JOSEPH A. YANNY, AN INDIVIDUAL.

21 MR. YANNY: AND JOSEPH A. YANNY ON BEHALF OF JOSEPH
22 A. YANNY, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION, YOUR HONOR.

23 THE COURT: THE COURT HAS BEFORE IT A QUESTION OF
24 WHAT, IF ANY -- WHETHER IT WILL ISSUE A PRELIMINARY
25 INJUNCTION OR NOT IN LIGHT OF CASE NO. BC 033035.

26 THE COURT HAS ISSUED THE TRO AS A STOPGAP
27 MEASURE. I'LL TELL YOU AT THE OUTSET THAT I THINK THAT
28 I'VE SIGNED IT FOR A TRO, BUT THAT IT'S TOO BROAD IN

1 NATURE, SO WE GET BACK TO THE FIRST ISSUE, HOWEVER, IS
2 WHETHER OR NOT ANY PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION SHOULD ISSUE.

3 TWO THINGS OCCUR HERE. THERE ARE TWO
4 PARTIES, NAMELY, THE QUESTION OF MR. YANNY REPRESENTING THE
5 AZNARANS AND MR. YANNY REPRESENTING MR. ARMSTRONG.

6 I MIGHT POINT OUT THAT IN YANNY I, AS IT'S
7 BEEN REFERRED TO -- AND YOU ALL KNOW THAT I'M REFERRING TO
8 THE OTHER CASE THAT WAS PRESENTED HERE IN COURT -- I'M NOT
9 GOING TO REPEAT IT, I'LL JUST REFER TO IT AS YANNY I --
10 YANNY I WAS, AMONG OTHER THINGS, A REQUEST BY PLAINTIFFS TO
11 PREVENT MR. YANNY FROM DISCLOSING SECRETS OR CONFIDENCES
12 THAT HE RECEIVED TO OTHERS, AND THE COURT RULED THAT THE
13 PLAINTIFF DID NOT PROVE ITS CASE, THAT IS, TO IDENTIFY THE
14 SECRETS OR THE CONFIDENCES THAT WERE BEING DISCLOSED, AND
15 THE COURT RULED THAT IT DID NOT, MEANING THE PLAINTIFFS,
16 DID NOT PROVE DAMAGE WITH RESPECT TO THAT.

17 THE PICTURE IS NOW CHANGED, AND PART OF THE
18 COURT'S OPINION IN YANNY I, THE COURT ALLUDED TO THE FACT
19 THAT MR. YANNY HAD SHOWN A PROPENSITY TO PERHAPS BE ON THE
20 BORDERLINE OF A BREACH OF A DUTY TO A FORMER CLIENT IN THE
21 OTHER CASE.

22 NOW, WHAT HAS TRANSPIRED IS THAT, FACTUALLY,
23 MR. YANNY REPRESENTED THE CHURCH, OR THE PLAINTIFFS, FOR A
24 PERIOD OF YEARS, AND THAT'S ADMITTED, AND AT THAT TIME, MS.
25 AZNARAN --

26 AND I FORGET HER HUSBAND'S NAME.

27 MR. YANNY: RICHARD.

28 THE COURT: -- RICHARD, WERE PART OF THE CHURCH, OR

1 THE PLAINTIFFS, AND SO NOW WE HAVE A SITUATION WHERE MR.
2 YANNY HAS ACTUALLY APPEARED FOR THE AZNARANS IN THE FEDERAL
3 COURT AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS, WHICH BRINGS INTO PLAY
4 WHETHER OR NOT -- WHETHER THERE IS A REMEDY WHERE A LAWYER
5 IS REPRESENTING SOMEONE AGAINST A FORMER CLIENT, AND THE
6 QUESTION IS WHETHER OR NOT THAT'S IN VIOLATION OF THE RULES
7 OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, RULE 33-310(D), AND ALSO RULES OF
8 PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT 6068, SUBDIVISIOIN (E).

9 THE PICTURE IS QUITE DIFFERENT THAN IN THE
10 FORMER CASE, BECAUSE, HERE, WE HAVE NO NEED FOR THE
11 PLAINTIFFS TO POINT OUT WHAT SPECIFIC SECRETS OR
12 CONFIDENCES ARE BEING DISCLOSED, BUT RATHER, IT'S PRESUMED
13 THAT THERE'S AN ADVERSE REPRESENTATION, AND THE ONLY ISSUE
14 THAT WE HAVE, AT LEAST RIGHT NOW, WOULD BE WHETHER THERE'S
15 A SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WHAT YANNY DID, OR FOR
16 THE PLAINTIFFS, WHAT INTERESTS HE REPRESENTED, VERSUS WHAT
17 HIS INTERESTS ARE NOW AND WHAT INTERESTS ARE BEING
18 REPRESENTED IN THE AZNARAN CASE.

19 THE ARMSTRONG CASE IS SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT,
20 ALTHOUGH I THINK IT'S UNDISPUTED THAT YANNY REPRESENTED THE
21 PLAINTIFFS AGAINST ARMSTRONG AT SOMETIME -- AND MAYBE
22 THAT'S A WRONG ASSUMPTION -- MR. YANNY'S SHAKING HIS HEAD
23 -- BUT MR. YANNY, I BELIEVE, REPRESENTED THE PLAINTIFFS IN
24 MANY RESPECTS, AND IN PARTICULAR, I THINK BROUGHT OR WAS IN
25 CHARGE OF LEGAL ACTION PRESERVING THE COPYRIGHT INTERESTS
26 OF THE PLAINTIFFS AND OTHER INTERESTS.

27 SO THE QUESTION HERE IS WHETHER OR NOT A
28 RESTRAINING ORDER SHOULD BE MADE TO PRECLUDE MR. YANNY FROM

1 REPRESENTING ARMSTRONG, PRESUMPTIVELY, IF HE IS. THAT'S A
2 QUESTION, I THINK, MR. YANNY DENIES, BUT EVEN IF HE WAS, IS
3 THERE A MATERIAL OR SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE
4 INTERESTS THAT MR. YANNY HAD IN PROTECTING FOR THE
5 PLAINTIFFS AND THOSE THAT HE PURSUES OR IS ALLEGED TO BE
6 PURSUING FOR MR. ARMSTRONG?

7 IT'S A LONG-WINDED WAY OF SUMMARIZING WHERE
8 WE'RE AT, AND TO BEGIN WITH, MR. VAN SICKLE: IN LIGHT OF
9 MR. YANNY'S ADMITTED REPRESENTATION OF AZNARANS IN FEDERAL
10 COURT, WHY ISN'T THERE A VIOLATION OF THE RULES OF
11 PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT THAT SHOULD BE RESTRAINED?

12 MR. VAN SICKLE: WELL, SEVERAL REASONS.

13 ONE, AS THE COURT HAS RECOGNIZED, IF HE
14 REPRESENTS THE AZNARANS IN FEDERAL COURT, THEN THE
15 APPROPRIATE REMEDY IS FOR THEM TO GO IN AND DISQUALIFY THEM
16 -- MR. YANNY.

17 NOW, DISQUALIFICATION IS NOT PUNITIVE IN
18 NATURE, SO, THEREFORE, WHEN YOU'RE INVOLVED IN A
19 DISQUALIFICATION, THE BURDEN'S A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT. THE
20 PRESUMPTIONS ARE DIFFERENT. THE PRESUMPTION OF, SAY,
21 DISCLOSING SECRETS, VARIOUS PRESUMPTIONS WORK IN THEIR
22 FAVOR IN A DISQUALIFICATION MOTION.

23 BUT THOSE SAME PRESUMPTIONS DO NOT OPERATE IN
24 A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, AND THAT MAKES SENSE. BECAUSE
25 WHEN YOU'RE GOING INTO COURT AND ASKING FOR
26 DISQUALIFICATION ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS, YOU'RE GOING THE
27 WAY YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO GO.

28 YOU COME INTO COURT ON A PRELIMINARY

1 INJUNCTION AND YOU'VE GOT TO MEET THE A, B, C'S OF
2 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS, AND A COUPLE OF THINGS THAT ARE IN
3 THE A, B, C'S OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION IS THEY HAVE TO
4 PROVE THAT WHAT MR. YANNY IS DOING IS WRONG.

5 THEY HAVE TO PROVE TO THIS COURT'S
6 SATISFACTION THAT THEY HAVE A REASONABLE PROBABILITY THAT
7 THEY'RE GOING TO WIN ON THE MERITS. ALL OF THOSE THINGS
8 THEY HAVE TO PROVE THAT THEY DON'T NECESSARILY HAVE TO
9 PROVE WHEN THEY'RE DISQUALIFYING HIM OVER IN FEDERAL COURT.

10 THE COURT: DOESN'T THIS COURT HAVE THE POWER AND
11 THE JURISDICTION TO PRECLUDE MR. YANNY FROM REPRESENTING --
12 INITIATING ANY CASE IN THIS STATE -- IN THE STATE -- WHERE
13 HE ALLEGEDLY REPRESENTS THE AZNARANS, PLURAL?

14 YOU'RE SAYING THAT THE COURTS OF THE VARIOUS
15 COUNTIES WILL HAVE TO BE -- YOU'LL HAVE TO PURSUE THEM IN
16 EVERY COUNTY TO BE DISQUALIFIED RATHER THAN THIS COURT
17 SIMPLY DISQUALIFYING MR. YANNY FROM REPRESENTING THEM
18 THROUGHOUT THE STATE?

19 MR. VAN SICKLE: SEVERAL QUESTIONS THERE.

20 ONE, THE QUESTION OF YOUR JURISDICTION. WE
21 HAVE CITED SOME CASE LAW, INCLUDING THE RECENT ONE IN JULY
22 ABOUT THIS COURT CAN'T GO AROUND ORDERING OTHER COURTS WHAT
23 TO DO.

24 THE COURT: WE'LL CUT ACROSS THAT, MR. VAN SICKLE.
25 WE'LL CUT ACROSS THAT TO BEGIN WITH.

26 IF THERE IS AN EXISTING CASE IN ANOTHER
27 COUNTY OF THIS STATE, THE PROCEDURE THERE WOULD BE THAT A
28 MOTION TO DISQUALIFY WOULD HAVE TO BE TAKEN, AND THAT WAY,

1 THIS COURT DOES NOT IMPINGE ON THE OTHER COUNTY'S
2 JURISDICTION.

3 HOWEVER, WHY CAN'T THIS COURT ISSUE AN
4 INJUNCTION PRECLUDING MR. YANNY FROM INITIATING ANY LAWSUIT
5 ON BEHALF OF THE AZNARANS AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS IN ANY --
6 IN THIS STATE?

7 MR. VAN SICKLE: BECAUSE THEY CAN'T COME IN IN FRONT
8 OF YOU, YOUR HONOR, AND MAKE THE A, B, C'S. THEY CAN'T
9 COME IN AND SHOW THERE'S REASONABLE PROBABILITY THAT MR.
10 YANNY IS GOING TO INITIATE A CASE FOR THE AZNARANS ANYMORE.
11 IT'S ALREADY THERE. THEY CAN'T MAKE A SHOWING THAT THERE'S
12 A REASONABLE POSSIBILITY THAT MR. YANNY'S GOING TO INITIATE
13 A CASE FOR MR. ARMSTRONG.

14 THERE'S NOTHING IN FRONT OF THE COURT THAT'S
15 SHOWING ANY IMMEDIATE THREAT OF HARM, SO WHAT THEY CAN'T DO
16 IS MEET THE THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS, THE A, B AND C'S OF
17 WHAT THEY NEED TO DO TO HAVE A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.
18 THERE IS NO THREAT. THERE'S NO IMMEDIATE HARM. THERE'S NO
19 THREAT OF IRREPARABLE INJURY.

20 SHOULD MR. YANNY INITIATE SUCH A CASE,
21 ALTHOUGH THEY'VE MADE NO SHOWING -- IT'S A REASONABLE
22 PROSPECT -- SHOULD HE DO IT, THE REMEDY, THEN, IS FOR THEM
23 TO GO IN ON A CASE-BY-CASE ANALYSIS AND CHALLENGE IT THERE.
24 AND THAT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE, BECAUSE THEN THE COURT CAN
25 LOOK AT THE CASE IN FRONT OF IT INSTEAD OF IN THE ABSTRACT.
26 THE COURT LOOKS AT THE CASE IN FRONT OF IT AND THEN THE
27 COURT CAN DEAL WITH THE WAIVER ISSUE, THE SUBSTANTIAL
28 RELATIONSHIP TEST.

1 IF THIS COURT IS GOING TO DO THAT, WHAT THIS
2 COURT IS GOING TO BE ASKED TO DO IS TO DO THE IMPOSSIBLE.
3 THIS COURT IS GOING TO BE ASKED TO DETERMINE IN THE
4 ABSTRACT WITHOUT ANY FACTS IN FRONT OF IT THAT LITERALLY
5 ANY CASE THAT MR. YANNY MIGHT CONSIDER, INITIATE, IS DE
6 FACTO SUBSTANTIALLY RELATED TO WHAT HE DID BEFORE.

7 AND THIS COURT'S GOING TO BE REQUESTED TO
8 RULE IN THE ABSTRACT THAT ANY OF THESE CASES CANNOT
9 POSSIBLY INVOLVE THE WAIVER QUESTION; THAT THESE CASES
10 CAN'T BE BROUGHT EVEN THOUGH THERE'S BEEN THIS SUBSTANTIAL
11 WAIVER.

12 SO WHAT THEY'RE TRYING TO GET YOU TO DO IS
13 CREATE A SITUATION WHERE THE WAIVER THAT'S OCCURRED IS
14 SWEEPED UNDER THE CARPET, WHERE THE SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP
15 TEST IS COMPLETELY IGNORED, AND IF YOU FIND THAT MR. YANNY
16 REPRESENTED SCIENTOLOGY, SOMEBODY WANTS TO SUE SCIENTOLOGY,
17 THEN MR. YANNY CAN'T SUE SCIENTOLOGY AND YOU DON'T GO
18 THROUGH ANY OF THE ANALYSIS AND, THEREFORE, THOSE ISSUES
19 GET SWEEPED UNDER THE CARPET, BUT PERHAPS MORE IMPORTANTLY,
20 THEY'RE COMING IN FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF.

21 THEY'RE ASKING YOU TO ISSUE SOME ORDERS THAT
22 ARE GOING TO BE USED AGAINST MR. YANNY. THEY'RE GOING TO
23 BE USED TO POLICE. THEY'RE GOING TO BE USED TO TAKE
24 DEPOSITIONS OF PEOPLE HE TALKS TO. THERE'S GOING TO BE A
25 CLOUD HANGING OVER HIS HEAD WITHOUT COMING IN AND SHOWING
26 THAT THERE'S ANY DANGER THAT IT'S GOING TO HAPPEN.

27 THE COURT: MR. VAN SICKLE, YOU'RE MAKING AN
28 ASSUMPTION, AND I GUESS A VALID ONE BASED ON THE TRO ISSUE.

1 I'VE ALREADY TOLD YOU, IT'S TOO BROAD. YOU'RE MAKING AN
2 ASSUMPTION THAT THIS COURT WOULD ISSUE AN ORDER TO PRECLUDE
3 MR. YANNY FROM ASSOCIATING, SPEAKING TO OR OTHERWISE HAVING
4 RELATIONSHIPS, SOCIAL OR OTHERWISE, WITH ANY PERSON,
5 AZNARANS AND OTHERS. THAT IS NOT THE INTENT.

6 NOW, IT IS A QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT AN
7 ORDER CAN BE FASHIONED IN A WAY THAT ALLOWS EVEN MR. YANNY
8 FROM HIRING, FOR EXAMPLE, ARMSTRONG AS HIS LAW CLERK OR AS
9 HIS PARALEGAL. CERTAINLY, THE COURT'S INTENT IS NOT TO
10 MAKE SUCH A BROAD ORDER THAT IT WOULD PRECLUDE ASSOCIATION,
11 DISCUSSION AND SO FORTH.

12 MR. VAN SICKLE: OKAY. WELL --

13 MR. YANNY: YOUR --

14 MR. VAN SICKLE: MR. YANNY -- IN ADDITION -- AGAIN,
15 THE FUNDAMENTAL FACT IS, EVEN IF YOU TRY TO NARROW THE
16 ORDER, YOU'RE NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO DO IT WITHOUT
17 INFRINGING ON HIS RIGHTS, WITHOUT DOING SOMETHING THAT ON
18 THE RECORD BEFORE THE COURT YOU SHOULDN'T DO, BECAUSE THEY
19 HAVEN'T SHOWN THE THREAT. WHAT'S HAPPENED?

20 HE'S APPEARED IN THE AZNARAN CASE. NOW, HE'S
21 OUT. THAT'S REALLY ALL THERE IS TO IT. HE'S TALKED TO
22 ARMSTRONG. WE'VE ASKED THE COURT TO TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE
23 OF THE ARMSTRONG DECISION THAT RECENTLY CAME DOWN. THAT
24 CASE IS OVER, BASICALLY, AND MR. YANNY ISN'T IN IT.

25 AND IF YOU LOOK AT THE CASE, YOU'LL SEE
26 SEVERAL THINGS. ONE, IT'S ABOUT SEALING COURT DOCUMENTS,
27 WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT MR. YANNY HAS A LEGITIMATE INTEREST
28 IN. IT'S ALSO PERTINENT TO THE ISSUE OF WHO SHOULD BE

1 BELIEVED, PERHAPS. BUT THE ARMSTRONG CASE, IF YOU LOOK AT
2 IT, IT'S ABOUT SEALING COURT RECORDS.

3 MR. YANNY IS A LITIGANT AGAINST THE CHURCH OF
4 SCIENTOLOGY. HE'S BEEN DEFAMED AGAIN, AND WE BROUGHT THE
5 TEXT THIS MORNING WHERE SCIENTOLOGY SAYS THAT HE DIDN'T --
6 HE WAS UNABLE TO PERFORM, HE DIDN'T DO GOOD WORK, HE WAS
7 FOUND TO BE BREACHING FIDUCIARY DUTIES, HE WAS FOUND TO BE
8 TAKING DRUGS.

9 NOW, THEY ATTACK HIM IN THE MEDIA, AND WHAT
10 THEY'RE SEEKING IS AN ORDER THAT WON'T ALLOW MR. YANNY TO
11 GO OUT AND GATHER HIS EVIDENCE TO START TALKING TO THE
12 WITNESSES, LIKE GERALD ARMSTRONG, TO START TO DO THE THINGS
13 THAT HE BELIEVES HE REASONABLY NEEDS TO DO. THEY'RE
14 ATTACKING HIM IN THE MEDIA. THEY'VE WAIVED ANY PRIVILEGE
15 ON THAT, AND HE HAS SOME RIGHT TO PROTECT HIS GOOD NAME AND
16 RESPOND TO THAT.

17 THE COURT: I THINK WE'RE CONFUSING THE MATTER.

18 I HAVE PREVIOUSLY STATED AND RULED IN YANNY I
19 THAT MR. YANNY HAS A LEGITIMATE RIGHT TO DEFEND HIMSELF BY
20 ACTIONS AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS, IF HE FEELS THAT HE'S
21 WRONGED, TO GATHER EVIDENCE TO PURSUE HIS CASE AGAINST THE
22 PLAINTIFFS, AND HE HAS A LEGITIMATE RIGHT TO THE EXTENT
23 THAT HE'S ATTACKED TO REACT AND PERHAPS TO BRING A LAWSUIT.

24 THAT'S NOT THE ISSUE. THE ISSUE HERE IS
25 WHETHER OR NOT MR. YANNY'S WILLINGNESS TO REPRESENT THE
26 AZNARANS IN THE FEDERAL COURT IS AN INDICATION THAT HE
27 WOULD DO THE SAME IN THE STATE COURTS WHERE HE BRINGS AN
28 ACTION AGAINST HIS FORMER CLIENTS WITHOUT THE FORMER

1 CLIENTS' CONSENTS ON A MATTER THAT MAY BE SUBSTANTIALLY --
2 HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP TO THOSE THINGS THAT YANNY
3 DID FOR THE PLAINTIFFS WHEN HE WAS THEIR LAWYER.

4 MR. VAN SICKLE: MR. YANNY WISHES TO ADDRESS THAT
5 POINT.

6 THE COURT: MR. YANNY.

7 MR. YANNY: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD ASK THE COURT TO
8 READ THE DECLARATION AGAIN THAT I SUBMITTED, AND IN THE
9 COURT'S OWN OPINION, WHAT THE COURT SAID IN YANNY I -- AND
10 I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT -- IS THAT IT MIGHT NOT
11 NECESSARILY BE IMPROPER FOR ME TO REPRESENT THE AZNARANS OR
12 OTHER PEOPLE AGAINST MY FORMER CLIENTS; THAT THAT SHOULD BE
13 DETERMINED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.

14 THE COURT: NO. NO. IT WASN'T THAT REFERENCE,
15 CASE-BY-CASE METHOD. I SIMPLY POINTED OUT THAT AT SOME
16 TIMES, THERE MAY BE SITUATIONS WHERE IT WOULD NOT BE A
17 VIOLATION IF A FORMER ATTORNEY REPRESENTED A PARTY AGAINST
18 THE FORMER CLIENT.

19 MR. YANNY: I BELIEVE YOUR HONOR DID MENTION IT
20 SHOULD BE DETERMINED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS, AND THAT
21 COUNSEL NOT REGULATE THE PRACTICE OF LAW, THAT SHOULD BE
22 DETERMINED BY THE STATE BAR.

23 YOUR HONOR, LET'S PUT THIS ALL BACK INTO
24 CONTEXT, BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, THEY HAVEN'T CONVEYED ANY
25 SECRETS TO ME SINCE I LAST LITIGATED WITH THEM IN YANNY I,
26 AND THIS COURT SPECIFICALLY FOUND THAT AT THE CONCLUSION OF
27 YANNY I -- AND I BELIEVE THEIR ISSUE PRECLUDED ON THIS --
28 THAT THERE WAS NOTHING THAT I KNEW THAT VICKI AZNARAN

1 DIDN'T KNOW. SHE WAS THE EXECUTIVE THERE.

2 AND I DON'T WANT TO GET LOST. BUT, YOUR
3 HONOR WANTS TO SOMEHOW DO EQUITY TO PROTECT THESE PEOPLE.
4 TO PROTECT THESE PEOPLE. AND I CAN UNDERSTAND THAT. IF
5 SOMEONE'S ENTITLED TO EQUITY. BUT THERE'S ALSO A DOCTRINE
6 OF UNCLEAN HANDS. NOW, WHAT ARE THEY ASKING YOU TO DO
7 EQUITY WITH RESPECT TO THEM?

8 LET'S NOT LOSE SIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE
9 CASE LAW SPECIFICALLY STATES THAT EVEN ON A CASE-BY-CASE
10 BASIS, A REQUEST TO DISQUALIFY IS BASICALLY A REQUEST IN
11 EQUITY THAT A LAWYER BE ENJOINED FROM PROCEEDING IN THE
12 REPRESENTATION IN WHICH HE IS ENGAGED UPON.

13 NOW, I THINK THE COURT CORRECTLY POINTED OUT
14 AT THE CONCLUSION OF YANNY I THAT THEY DIDN'T SHOW THAT I
15 HAD VIOLATED ANY CONFIDENCES.

16 THE COURT: MR. YANNY, WE'RE NOT GOING TO REPEAT ALL
17 OF THAT, BUT YOU WILL NOTE THAT IN YANNY I, YANNY WAS NOT
18 ATTORNEY OF RECORD FOR AZNARANS. YANNY HAD THE AZNARANS IN
19 HIS HOME. THAT WASN'T SUFFICIENT. YANNY ACTUALLY DROVE
20 AZNARANS TO SEE OTHER LAWYERS.

21 MR. YANNY: CORRECT, YOUR HONOR.

22 THE COURT: THE COURT RULED THAT THAT WASN'T AN
23 ADVERSE REPRESENTATION AGAINST A FORMER CLIENT.

24 BUT THOSE FACTS WERE SKIRTING THE BOUNDARIES
25 OF WHERE YOU PASS INTO A VIOLATION OF THE RULES I'VE SET
26 OUT BEFORE, WHICH SAYS THAT YOU CANNOT REPRESENT A CLIENT
27 AGAINST A FORMER CLIENT WHERE THERE'S SUBSTANTIAL
28 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUBJECT MATTERS OF REPRESENTATION,

1 WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE FORMER CLIENT.

2 MR. YANNY: YOUR HONOR --

3 THE COURT: AND THAT IS WHAT WE'RE ABOUT IN THE CASE
4 WHERE YANNY REPRESENTED AND BECAME OF RECORD FOR THE
5 AZNARANS IN THE FEDERAL COURT.

6 MR. YANNY: AND YOUR HONOR, THAT IS PRECISELY WHERE
7 IT SHOULD BE DETERMINED AS TO WHETHER THERE WAS A
8 SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WHAT I DID FOR THEM, FOR
9 THESE PEOPLE, AND WHAT I DIDN'T DO.

10 I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT, YOUR HONOR, THERE
11 COMES A POINT IN TIME WHERE THEY CROSS THE LINE AS FAR AS
12 CLAIMING LICENSE TO STOP ME FROM SAYING THINGS IN MY OWN
13 DEFENSE. IN THAT REGARD, I'D LIKE TO PUT INTO THIS COURT,
14 BECAUSE I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT -- AND I'LL GIVE YOU -- AND
15 I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY OF THE LAWS OF THE
16 UNITED STATES AND THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAT WHAT I'M
17 ABOUT TO GIVE THE COURT IS THE DECLARATION OF MICHAEL T.
18 STOLLER SUPPLIED BY MY ESTEEM OPPOSITION MR. DRESCHER IN A
19 CASE ACROSS THE HALL HERE, BENT CORYDON V. CHURCH OF
20 SCIENTOLOGY AND RELATED CROSS ACTIONS, IN WHICH THEY WERE
21 TRYING TO DISQUALIFY MR. VAN SICKLE, WHICH ATTEMPT WAS
22 DENIED, WHICH ATTEMPT WAS THEN FURTHER DENIED BY THE COURT
23 OF APPEALS ON A WRIT.

24 AND ALSO, A TRUE AND ACCURATE COPY OF WHAT I
25 PLACED UP THERE ALREADY, "FACT VERSUS FICTION," A
26 PUBLICATION THAT CAME OUT BY THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY.

27 MR. DRESCHER: YOUR HONOR ALREADY REJECTED THAT ONE.

28 MR. YANNY: YOU CAN OBJECT ALL YOU WANT, BUT I'M

1 GOING TO FINISH.

2 MR. DRESCHER: I DIDN'T OBJECT. I POINTED OUT TO
3 THE COURT THAT HE'S --

4 THE COURT: LET HIM FINISH.

5 MR. YANNY: THE STATEMENT IS, "BEHAR" -- THE "TIME
6 MAGAZINE STATEMENT" -- THIS IS ON PAGE 9 OF "FACT VERSUS
7 FICTION" (READING):

8
9 "BEHAR PORTRAYS FORMER CHURCH ATTORNEY
10 JOSEPH YANNY AS AN EXPERT ON THE CHURCH OF
11 SCIENTOLOGY. THE TIME ARTICLE ATTEMPTS TO
12 PUT THE CHURCH ON TRIAL USING FALSE CLAIMS
13 THAT WERE SPECIFICALLY EXCLUDED FROM THE
14 LITIGATION WITH YANNY BY THE TRIAL JUDGE --
15 E.G., THAT YANNY WAS ASKED TO STEAL RECORDS
16 FOR THE CHURCH, AND WAS THE SUBJECT OF
17 CHURCH," QUOTE "'HARASSMENT,'" END QUOTE,
18 COMMA, "INCLUDING DEATH THREATS AND
19 BURGLARIES.

20 "TRUE INFORMATION:"

21 PAGE 9.

22 "YANNY IS A FORMER ATTORNEY FOR THE
23 CHURCH WHO WAS FOUND TO BE TAKING LSD WHEN
24 SCIENTOLOGY EXECUTIVES INVESTIGATED WHY YANNY
25 WAS UNABLE TO MAINTAIN AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF
26 PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT.

27 "AFTER LEAVING CHURCH EMPLOY, YANNY
28 PROCEEDED TO BREAK ATTORNEY-CLIENT

1 CONFIDENCES. IN SUBSEQUENT LITIGATION WITH
2 YANNY CONCERNING HIS BREACH OF CONTRACTUAL
3 AGREEMENT, SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE CARDENAS
4 FOUND THAT YANNY SHOWED," QUOTE, "'A READY
5 WILLINGNESS TO DISREGARD LEGAL AND ETHICAL
6 RESPONSIBILITIES OWED TO HIS FORMER
7 CLIENTS,'" END QUOTE.

8
9 OKAY. THEY DIDN'T SAY "ALLEGED." SEE, THEY
10 ATTACK ME IN THIS THING.

11 I DON'T KNOW. YOUR HONOR POINTED OUT QUITE
12 CLEARLY THAT WHEN MR. COOLEY AND REVEREND RATHBUN HERE WENT
13 DOWN TO TEXAS AND WERE TALKING TO THE AZNARANS AND IMPUNED
14 MY INTEGRITY, IMPUNED MY ABILITY, THEY HAD TO SOME DEGREE
15 WAIVED THE PRIVILEGE. THEY'VE DEFAMED ME WITH THIS THING,
16 AND THEY DID IT BEFORE THEY FILED THIS LAWSUIT AND SOUGHT
17 THIS TRO.

18 NOW, THE PROBLEM IS, I'D LIKE TO GET MIKE
19 FLYNN TO TAKE MY CASE, BUT YOU KNOW, JUDGE, YOU WANT TO DO
20 EQUITY. LET'S TALK ABOUT EQUITY HERE. MIKE FLYNN'S BEEN
21 BOUGHT OFF BY A SECRET AGREEMENT THAT IS AGAINST PUBLIC
22 POLICY, IS AGAINST THE LAW, AND ALSO ELIMINATED HIM FROM
23 THE POOL OF RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO VICKI AND RICHARD
24 AZNARAN.

25 THE COURT: MR. YANNY, THOSE AGREEMENTS, APPARENTLY,
26 PASSED MUSTER AND THEY WERE APPROVED BY A COURT.

27 MR. YANNY: NO, JUDGE. SEE, THAT IS ONE OF THE
28 OTHER FALSITIES THAT YOU'RE BUYING INTO, BECAUSE THOSE

1 AGREEMENTS WERE NEVER PLACED BEFORE A COURT. AND JUDGE
2 BRECKENRIDGE --

3 THE COURT: MR. YANNY, YOU HAVE CITED HERE IN THE
4 LAST TWO OR THREE MINUTES, APPARENTLY, WHAT APPEARS TO BE A
5 GOOD BASIS FOR A SUIT AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS, BUT THAT'S
6 NOT WHAT WE'RE HERE ABOUT, EXCEPT INSOFAR AS YOUR COMMENTS
7 ARE AN ATTEMPT TO POINT OUT THAT THE COURT'S REMEDY HERE IS
8 EQUITABLE IN NATURE AND THEY SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED BECAUSE
9 OF THEIR UNCLEAN HANDS.

10 MR. YANNY: EXACTLY, YOUR HONOR.

11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

12 MR. YANNY: THEY CANNOT ATTACK.

13 I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT FOR THE COURT, YOUR
14 HONOR. YOU PLACED, APPARENTLY, A LOT OF WEIGHT UPON THE
15 DECISION OF JUDGE IDEMAN.

16 I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT FOR THE RECORD THAT
17 JUDGE IDEMAN'S DECISION WAS REACHED WITHOUT BRIEFING. HE
18 DID THAT SUI SPONTE.

19 I WOULD ALSO ASK THE COURT INSOFAR AS YOU
20 WANT TO DO EQUITY HERE TODAY, TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING
21 FACT: OKAY. I DID NOT FILE AN OPPOSITION BRIEF OVER
22 THERE. I'D LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OVER
23 THERE.

24 THE COURT: WELL, PERHAPS YOU OUGHT TO DO THAT. BUT
25 FOR NOW, YOU'RE GOING TO SIT DOWN BECAUSE I'M NOT GOING
26 SPEND ALL THE TIME THIS MORNING ON THIS CASE.

27 MR. YANNY: ONE OTHER POINT. ONE OTHER POINT THAT
28 NEEDS TO BE ON THE RECORD.

1 THE COURT: MR. YANNY, YOU WILL BE SEATED FOR A
2 MOMENT.

3 MR. VAN SICKLE.

4 MR. VAN SICKLE: YES.

5 THE COURT: I WANT YOU TO -- THE OTHER ISSUE HERE IS
6 WHETHER OR NOT AN ISSUE RESTRAINING MR. YANNY FROM
7 REPRESENTING ARMSTRONG IN THIS CASE. I RECOGNIZE THAT IT'S
8 PROBABLY -- THAT COMPLAINT, THAT PORTION, WILL BE DENIED,
9 BECAUSE YANNY IN HIS OWN DECLARATION HAS INDICATED THAT HE
10 DOES NOT REPRESENT ARMSTRONG AS A LAWYER. SO YOUR BEST
11 ARGUMENT IS THAT THERE'S NO LIKELIHOOD THAT PLAINTIFFS WILL
12 PREVAIL VIS-A-VIS ARMSTRONG.

13 MR. VAN SICKLE: THAT'S A SUMMARY JUDGMENT ISSUE.
14 THEY SHOULD LOSE IN THAT SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS SOON AS WE GET
15 THE PAPERS TOGETHER, SO THERE'S NO SHOWING -- THERE'S NO
16 SHOWING OF HARM, NO SHOWING OF ANYTHING.

17 THEY'VE GOT JOE AND ARMSTRONG LOOKING AT A
18 CODE FILE TOGETHER IN FEDERAL COURT. THEY'RE DOING SOME
19 WORK TOGETHER WORKING ON LITERARY MATTERS. THAT'S IT. AND
20 ALSO, THERE'S NO ONGOING LITIGATION. THERE'S NOTHING
21 THEY'VE SHOWN THAT JOE CAN REALLY IMPACT.

22 THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND. THE DISTINCTION IS THAT
23 WE KNOW THAT MR. YANNY DID BECOME ATTORNEY OF RECORD IN THE
24 FEDERAL CASE AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS FOR AZNARANS.

25 MR. VAN SICKLE: AND HE HAS EXPLAINED IN HIS
26 DECLARATION THE REASONS.

27 THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND.

28 MR. VAN SICKLE: HE WANTED TO TEST THE WATERS

1 BECAUSE HE PERCEIVED THERE WAS AN EMERGENCY, NOT BECAUSE HE
2 WANTED TO CARRY ON A CAMPAIGN, NOT BECAUSE HE WANTS TO
3 REPRESENT EVERYBODY AGAINST SCIENTOLOGY, NOT BECAUSE HE
4 WANTS 100 OTHER CASES, BUT ONLY BECAUSE HE WAS VERY
5 CONCERNED A DEFAULT MIGHT OCCUR BECAUSE HE COULDN'T GET
6 EXTENSIONS OF TIME.

7 THEY WERE IN PRO PER, AND THERE WERE THINGS
8 THAT NEEDED BEING HANDLED. HE THOUGHT THAT THE SUBSTANTIAL
9 RELATIONSHIP TEST PLUS THE WAIVER, INCLUDING THE TIME
10 ARTICLE AND THIS "FACT VERSUS FICTION," AND THE FACT THEY
11 MADE ALLEGATIONS IN THE COUNTY CLAIM THAT HE WAS A
12 CONSPIRATOR OF SORTS, AND HE WAS ONE OF THE PEOPLE THAT
13 HELPED THE AZNARANS DO THE THINGS THAT THEY ALLEGEDLY DID
14 THAT WERE WRONG --

15 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

16 MR. VAN SICKLE: BUT GIVEN ALL THOSE THINGS, HE
17 THOUGHT THAT THAT WAS AN UNUSUAL CASE, AND IT WAS HIS
18 OPINION, BASED IN PART UPON YOUR OPINION, BASED UPON HIS
19 RESEARCH, BASED UPON EVENTS, THAT IT WAS NOT WRONG FOR HIM
20 TO DO IT. AND HE SAID, YOU KNOW, I'LL GO IN. I'M GOING TO
21 TEST THE WATER AND SEE WHAT JUDGE IDEMAN PLANS TO DO.

22 NOW, IF HE'S PRESENTED WITH A SITUATION
23 WHERE, IN THOSE RARE CASES, WHERE HE WANTS TO TOUCH THE
24 WATERS, LOOK AT IT THE OTHER WAY, IS HE GOING TO HAVE TO
25 TEST THEM BOTH PLACES?

26 DOES HE HAVE TO GO OVER AND ENTER AN
27 APPEARANCE IN JUDGE IDEMAN'S CHAMBERS AND SURVIVE NOT ONLY
28 A MOTION TO DISQUALIFY, BUT ALSO GET SUED AND CALLED A

1 COMMON TORT-FEASOR EVERY TIME HE TRIES TO TEST THE WATERS?
2 THERE'S SOMETHING VERY WRONG WITH THAT. HE
3 SHOULD ONLY HAVE TO DO IT IN ONE FORM AND THAT SHOULD BE IN
4 THE CASE THAT'S INVOLVED.

5 THE COURT: MR. DRESCHER, ON THE OTHER SIDE, WHAT IS
6 YOUR BEST ARGUMENT IN THE REQUEST AGAINST REPRESENTATION OF
7 MR. ARMSTRONG?

8 I WILL ASSUME THAT YOUR COMPLAINT WILL BE
9 DENIED INSOFAR AS YANNY IN HIS DECLARATION POINTS OUT THAT
10 HE DOESN'T REPRESENT ARMSTRONG, SO I WOULD ASSUME THERE'LL
11 BE A DENIAL OF THAT IN THE COMPLAINT -- TO THE COMPLAINT.

12 WHAT REASON OR WHAT BASIS CAN THIS COURT
13 RESTRAIN HIM FROM REPRESENTING MR. ARMSTRONG, WHICH HE SAYS
14 HE DOESN'T IN ANY EVENT?

15 MR. DRESCHER: HE SAID THAT ONCE HE GOT HERE.
16 THAT'S NOT WHAT HE SAID OUTSIDE THE COURT. AND SINCE THE
17 COURT HAS TO, IN THIS KIND OF CIRCUMSTANCE, ASSESS SOME
18 CREDIBILITY FACTORS HERE, LET ME JUST REMIND THE COURT OF
19 THE FOLLOWING DETAILS CONCERNING THE ARMSTRONG
20 REPRESENTATION.

21 MR. YANNY: YOUR HONOR, MAY I BE EXCUSED?

22 THE COURT: WELL, THEREFORE, YANNY, THE INDIVIDUAL
23 IS NO LONGER HERE.

24 MR. YANNY: I'LL STAY.

25 THE COURT: BUT SINCE I'LL HAVE TO MAKE AN ORDER AT
26 THE CONCLUSION, I THINK YOU BETTER STAY.

27 MR. YANNY: ALL RIGHT, YOUR HONOR.

28 THE COURT: YES.

1 MR. DRESCHER: FIRST, KENDRICK MOXON STUMBLED UPON
2 MR. ARMSTRONG AND MR. YANNY TOGETHER GOING OVER A FILE
3 UNRELATED TO MR. ARMSTRONG AND MR. YANNY'S RELATIONSHIP
4 WITH THE CHURCH, AT LEAST ON THE SURFACE, EXCEPT THAT IT
5 WAS A CHURCH CASE.

6 THAT THE TWO OF THEM, TOGETHER, FIRST TRIED
7 TO CONCEAL FROM MOXON. WHEN MOXON DIRECTLY ASKED THE TWO
8 OF THEM, AS YANNY AND ARMSTRONG STOOD SIDE BY SIDE, HE
9 ASKED ARMSTRONG, IS HE YOUR LAWYER, AND IT WAS A KEYSTONE
10 COP SCENE, BECAUSE ARMSTRONG STOOD THERE AND NODDED YES,
11 AND WHEN YANNY STARTS SAYING NO, THEN HE BACKTRACKS AND HE
12 FINALLY OWNS UP THAT HE'S HIS LAWYER AND TRIES TO SKIRT
13 AWAY IN THIS LITERARY MATTER ISSUE.

14 BUT THE THING THAT KEEPS COMING BACK TO MY
15 MIND ON THIS SUBJECT IS, JUST AS HE DID IN THE FIRST TRIAL,
16 JUST AS HE DID IN THE FIRST CASE WHERE MR. YANNY AND SOME
17 OF HIS ALLIES WENT TO EXTRAORDINARY LENGTHS TO CREATE
18 PRIVILEGE TO AVOID EXPLORING WHAT'S GOING ON, MR. ARMSTRONG
19 HAS GONE TO NEW AND EVEN MORE EXTRAORDINARY LENGTHS TO LAY
20 IN AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE, TO LAY IN A
21 PARALEGAL-EMPLOYER PRIVILEGE, TO LAY IN EVEN A
22 PRIEST-PENITENT PRIVILEGE, THE VERY SAME ONE BENT CORYDON
23 PERPETRATED ON THE COURT BEFORE.

24 IF IT WERE A SIMPLE MATTER OF BEING ABLE TO
25 SAY, NO, I DON'T REPRESENT HIM, AS THE DECLARATION DOES,
26 WELL, THAT SHOULD BE THE END OF IT, AND THAT SHOULD BE IT.
27 BUT IT'S NOT, YOUR HONOR. THIS ISN'T A VACUUM. THIS ISN'T
28 A NEW ONE. THERE'S THE DISSEMBLING IN THE COURTHOUSE.

1 THERE'S ARMSTRONG AND YANNY GOING TO GREAT LENGTHS TO
2 CONCOCT THESE DECLARATIONS, AND FRANKLY, MR. YANNY'S
3 PROCLIVITY FOR RUNNING AROUND FINDING ADVERSE LITIGANTS,
4 BECAUSE DON'T LOSE THE FACT THAT ARMSTRONG WAS IN
5 LITIGATION AT THE TIME THAT THAT INCIDENT TOOK PLACE, LEADS
6 RIGHT INTO THE OTHER PROBLEM HERE, BECAUSE THERE'S ONLY SO
7 MUCH THAT CAN BE DONE ON A DISQUALIFICATION.

8 WHAT CAN BE DONE IN THE DISQUALIFICATION WAS
9 DONE BY JUDGE IDEMAN. THAT DOESN'T STOP HIM FROM BEING A
10 LAWYER, DE FACTO. THAT DOESN'T STOP HIM FROM OPERATING IN
11 THE WEEDS. THAT DOESN'T EXCUSE HIM FROM THE STOCKTON
12 THEATERS COURT THAT YOUR HONOR MENTIONED AND WHICH THE
13 DEFENDANTS HAVE ASSIDUOUSLY AVOIDED MENTIONING.

14 IT DOESN'T RELIEVE THEM OF THE OBLIGATION
15 THAT -- WELL STATED BY THE COURT ON PAGE 81 -- THE
16 OBLIGATION TO REPRESENT THE CLIENT WITH UNDIVIDED FIDELITY.
17 AND IT ALSO PRECLUDES THE LAWYER FOR ACTING FOR OTHERS IN
18 ANY MATTER. DOESN'T SAY LITIGATION. ". . . ANY MATTERS
19 WHERE SUCH SECRETS OR CONFIDENCES OR KNOWLEDGE OF THE
20 CLIENTS' AFFAIRS ACQUIRED IN THE COURSE OF THE EARLIER
21 EMPLOYMENT CAN BE USED TO THE FORMER CLIENT'S
22 DISADVANTAGE."

23 THAT'S THE PROBLEM WITH ARMSTRONG, AND IT'S A
24 DRAMATIC PROBLEM WITH THE AZNARANS.

25 THE COURT: AS FAR AS ARMSTRONG IS CONCERNED, WHAT
26 IS THE EVIDENCE AS OPPOSED TO SURMISE THAT -- DID MR. YANNY
27 WHILE HE REPRESENTED THE PLAINTIFFS BRING ANY ACTION OR BE
28 A LAWYER IN ANY ACTION BROUGHT AGAINST ARMSTRONG?

1 MR. DRESCHER: IN THE MC SHANE DECLARATION, THERE IS
2 -- AND I DON'T HAVE THE PARAGRAPH AT MY FINGERTIPS -- BUT
3 IN THE MC SHANE DECLARATION, MR. MC SHANE SAYS THAT DURING
4 THE PERIOD IN WHICH THOSE AGREEMENTS, SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS
5 TO WHICH MR. YANNY SO FONDLY REFERS WERE CREATED, ONE OF
6 THE SIGNERS WAS ARMSTRONG. THAT MR. YANNY'S ADVICE AND
7 COUNSEL WAS SOUGHT ON ENTERING INTO THOSE AGREEMENTS, WITH
8 A NUMBER OF PARTIES, INCLUDING GARY ARMSTRONG. THE ENTIRE
9 ARMSTRONG MATTER WAS DISCUSSED TO PUT IT IN CONTEXT.

10 YOUR HONOR, WOULD YOU ASK THEM TO PLEASE KEEP
11 THEIR VOICES DOWN. NOW, THEY'RE TRYING TO DELIBERATELY
12 INTERRUPT. IT'S A HABIT OF MR. YANNY'S, AS THE COURT
13 KNOWS.

14 THE COURT: WELL, MR. YANNY, COOL IT.

15 MR. DRESCHER: IN ANY EVENT, ARMSTRONG HAVING BEEN A
16 LITIGANT FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, ARMSTRONG WAS SPECIFICALLY
17 APPROACHED AND HIS ADVICE AND COUNSEL SOUGHT REGARDING THE
18 SETTLEMENT, PARTIAL SETTLEMENT OF THE ARMSTRONG CASE THAT
19 WAS UPHELD. HE GAVE ADVICE. I WISH I COULD TELL YOU WHAT
20 IT WAS, BUT IT'S PRIVILEGED, BUT CONSIDERING THE
21 REPRESENTATIONS HE'S MADE ABOUT IT, IT'S AN EXTRAORDINARY
22 THING, BUT THERE IT IS.

23 THE ENTIRE ARMSTRONG CASE WAS LAID OUT TO
24 YANNY BY MR. MC SHANE. MR. YANNY GAVE ADVICE ON THE
25 SETTLEMENT AND HOW THE CHURCH PARTY SETTLING WITH ARMSTRONG
26 SHOULD APPROACH IT AND THAT WAS IT.

27 NOW, THAT MATTER PERSISTED AS THE COURT HAS
28 SEEN IN THE ARMSTRONG OPINION ON UP UNTIL LAST WEEK AND,

1 YOU KNOW, WHO KNOWS WHAT HAPPENS AT THIS POINT, BUT THE
2 TRUTH OF THE MATTER IS, HE REPRESENTED THE CHURCH ON BEHALF
3 OF ARMSTRONG. HE'S NOW REPRESENTING ARMSTRONG BY HIS OWN
4 ADMISSION, AND AS AN AFTERTHOUGHT SAID, IT WASN'T ON THIS
5 MATTER.

6 THERE ARE ALSO TWO BILLS THAT HAVE BEEN
7 SUBMITTED WITH RESPECT TO THE ARMSTRONG REPRESENTATION,
8 BILLS OF MR. YANNY'S OFFICE. SO I CAN'T STAND THERE AND
9 TELL YOU THAT THE EVIDENCE IS AS COMPELLING AS THE
10 AZNARANS, BUT IT IS COMPELLING AND IT IS COMPLETELY
11 CONSISTENT WITH A PATTERN THAT'S BEEN PRESENTED OVER AND
12 OVER AGAIN TO THE COURT.

13 THE COURT: MR. YANNY, YOU HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY NOW
14 TO ADDRESS THE COURT.

15 MR. YANNY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

16 FIRST OF ALL, I NEVER MADE AN APPEARANCE IN
17 THE ARMSTRONG CASE, SINCE HE'S MADE REPRESENTATIONS --

18 THE COURT: I'LL ASSUME THERE WAS NO APPEARANCE.

19 MR. YANNY: THERE WAS NO APPEARANCE.

20 AND WHAT I TOLD THEM ABOUT THOSE AGREEMENTS
21 IS QUITE SIMPLE. I TOLD THEM THEY WERE AN OBSTRUCTION OF
22 JUSTICE, THEY WERE A FRAUD ON THE COURT, THEY WERE
23 UNENFORCEABLE AND A VARIETY OF OTHER THINGS, ALL OF WHICH
24 TOOK IT OUTSIDE THE PRIVILEGE.

25 I MEAN, YOU HEARD PAUL MORANTZ. I GAVE YOU
26 SOME OF PAUL MORANTZ' TESTIMONY. NONE OF THAT STUFF EVER
27 GOT TO THE COURTS. THOSE HAVE NEVER BEEN APPROVED.

28 NOW, IF YOU WANT TO DO EQUITY, IF YOU WANT TO

1 DO EQUITY, LET'S GET INTO WHETHER THESE PEOPLE HAVE SO
2 LIMITED THE AVAILABLE POOL OF LEGAL RESOURCES THAT IT IS,
3 AS YOUR HONOR POINTED OUT -- TO QUOTE FROM THE COURT AT THE
4 LAST HEARING, PAGE 6, YOU CITED A CASE.

5 YOU SAID, "ALSO, STOCKTON THEATERS V.
6 PALERMO" -- AND I QUOTE THIS PART OF IT, AND I'M QUOTING
7 THE COURT (READING):

8
9 "IS THERE A SUFFICIENTLY SUBSTANTIAL
10 RELATIONSHIP IN THE SUBJECT MATTER BETWEEN
11 THE PAST AND PRESENT REPRESENTATION SO AS TO
12 RENDER THE PRESENT EMPLOYMENT," AND I
13 EMPHASIZED THIS, "UNQUESTIONABLE IN LIGHT OF
14 THE PAST," END QUOTES -- "CLOSED QUOTES,"
15 SAYS THE COURT.

16
17 NOW, IF YOU WANT TO TALK ABOUT EQUITY HERE,
18 LET'S TALK ABOUT WHETHER THOSE AGREEMENTS, NONE OF WHICH
19 WERE EVER PRESENTED TO THE COURT FOR APPROVAL, AND WHICH
20 PAUL MORANTZ ATTEMPTED TO TESTIFY ABOUT BUT YOUR HONOR
21 EXCLUDED UNDER 352, WHETHER THOSE AGREEMENTS, WHEREBY
22 LAWYERS AGREED NOT TO TAKE CASES IN THE FUTURE, WOULD MAKE
23 IT UNEQUITABLE FOR ME NOT TO BE PERMITTED TO TAKE CASES
24 THAT ARE SO DISTANTLY RELATED, IF AT ALL, TO MY PRIOR
25 REPRESENTATION OF THESE PEOPLE.

26 NOW, I REALLY HAVE NO DESIRE TO DO THAT. I
27 STEPPED INTO THE AZNARAN CASE FOR ONE REASON AND ONE REASON
28 ONLY, BECAUSE CONSISTENT WITH THE ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES AND

1 THE UNETHICAL ACTIVITIES OF MR. QUINN AND MR. DRESCHER WITH
2 RESPECT TO BYPASSING THE REPRESENTATION OF THE AZNARANS TO
3 GET MESSAGES TO THEM, THAT THEY OUGHT TO DROP THEIR CURRENT
4 LAWYER AND TALK TO THESE PEOPLE IN PRO PER ABOUT SETTLING.

5 OKAY. THEY ENDED UP IN A SITUATION THAT WAS
6 UNEQUITABLE, AND THAT IS THAT THESE PEOPLE WOULD HAVE BEEN
7 WITHOUT REPRESENTATION AND FACED WITH MOUNDS OF SUMMARY
8 JUDGMENT MOTIONS THAT THEY COULD NOT HAVE RESPONDED TO. AS
9 AN OFFICER OF THE COURT, I DID THE ONE THING I THOUGHT WAS
10 THE APPROPRIATE THING.

11 OKAY. NOW, INsofar AS ARMSTRONG IS
12 CONCERNED, I DON'T REPRESENT ARMSTRONG IN HIS LITIGATION.

13 THE COURT: IF YOU DON'T, THEN YOU SHOULDN'T HAVE
14 ANY CAUSE TO COMPLAIN OF AN ORDER THAT PRECLUDES YOU FROM
15 REPRESENTING HIM AS AN ATTORNEY.

16 MR. YANNY: YOUR HONOR, WOULD -- IF HE WANTS TO COME
17 TO ME AND TALK TO ME ABOUT ART WORK, PROCEDURE NOTICES,
18 PUBLICATIONS, THESE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO LOOK
19 OVER MY SHOULDER AND ASK ME WHAT IT IS I'M DOING WITH HIM.

20 NO. THIS COURT PROPERLY NOTED IN ITS OPINION
21 IN YANNY I THAT IF THERE'S ALLEGATIONS OF THAT NATURE, THE
22 PROPER PLACE TO DO THAT IS BEFORE THE STATE BAR. THAT WAY,
23 I DON'T HAVE TO WAIVE PRIVILEGE WITH RESPECT TO MY
24 COMMUNICATIONS WITH RESPECT TO MR. ARMSTRONG IN THE EXTENT
25 OF THE REPRESENTATION THAT DOES EXIST.

26 LET'S SAY, HE COMES TO ME AND HE WANTS TO
27 KNOW ABOUT PROPER COPYRIGHT NOTICES, HE WANTS TO KNOW ABOUT
28 CONVENTION APPLICATIONS BASED ON TRADEMARKS, ET CETERA, ET

1 CETERA, NOTHING TO DO WITH ADVERSE REPRESENTATION OF
2 SCIENTOLOGY. THEY DO NOT HAVE THE RIGHT --

3 THE COURT: MR. YANNY, I STATED THAT THE TRO WAS TOO
4 BROAD IN THAT IT IS THE COURT'S INTENT NOT TO PRECLUDE
5 ASSOCIATION, DISCUSSION, AND SO FORTH, AND I THOUGHT THAT
6 WOULD SEND THE MESSAGE THAT IF THERE WAS AN ORDER, IT WOULD
7 BE A LOT MORE NARROW THAN THE TRO THAT WAS SIGNED.

8 MR. YANNY: YOUR HONOR, BUT BASED ON THE STRENGTH OF
9 WHAT THEY'VE SHOWN; NOTHING?

10 AND WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO DO BY GIVING THESE,
11 THE MOST LITIGIOUS PEOPLE IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, MAYBE
12 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND MAYBE THE UNITED STATES,
13 YOU'RE GOING TO GIVE THEM AN ORDER BY WHICH THEY ARE THEN
14 GOING TO HARASS EVERY ONE OF MY EMPLOYEES LIKE YOU SAW THEM
15 DO BEFORE, EVERY ONE OF MY CLIENTS, LIKE YOU SAW THEM DO
16 BEFORE.

17 OKAY. AND THAT, BASED ON THE STRENGTH OF
18 WHAT THEY SHOWED, YOU KNOW, IT IS -- I HATE TO SAY THIS --
19 THAT IS INEQUITABLE -- THAT IS INEQUITABLE -- AND ALL OF
20 THIS BECAUSE I DID ONE THING; I HIRED GERRY ARMSTRONG AS A
21 PARALEGAL TO HELP ME ON THE AZNARAN CASE?

22 THE COURT: NO. ALL BECAUSE --

23 MR. YANNY: I TOLD HIM ABOUT COPYRIGHT NOTICES AND I
24 MADE AN APPEARANCE IN A FEDERAL CASE AND THAT THE JUDGE
25 DISQUALIFIED ME.

26 I DON'T THINK AN ORDER IS APPROPRIATE. THIS
27 CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN THROWN OUT WHEN YOU SAW THE
28 COMPLAINT.

1 THE COURT: MR. QUINN, YOU HAVE THE LAST WORD
2 BECAUSE I'M ABOUT TO MAKE MY ORDER.

3 MR. QUINN: YOUR HONOR, I'D LIKE TO BE ABLE TO
4 CONTRIBUTE SOMETHING HERE AND, PERHAPS, BECAUSE I DON'T
5 HAVE THE LONG BACKGROUND THAT ALL OF YOU DO, MAYBE I HAVE
6 THE OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE JUST A LITTLE FRESHER LOOK.

7 THE COURT TALKED ABOUT THE ORDER THAT WE'RE
8 SEEKING IN THIS CASE, AND IN ESSENCE, REFERRED TO IT AS
9 BROAD. WHEN I FIRST APPROACHED THIS, I THOUGHT IT WAS
10 BROAD, TOO, BUT ON REFLECTION, WHEN I HEAR EVERYTHING
11 THAT'S GONE ON HERE AND THE CONDUCT AND THE BACKGROUND AND
12 FOUR YEARS OF MR. YANNY REPRESENTING THE CHURCH, I LOOKED
13 AT THE ORDER AGAIN, AND IN TALKING ABOUT REPRESENTING
14 ARMSTRONG AND REPRESENTING AZNARANS; YOU KNOW, YOUR HONOR,
15 THE ONLY THING THAT WE ARE SEEKING IN THIS MATTER IS A VERY
16 SIMPLE AND REALLY QUITE A NARROW ORDER.

17 IT DOESN'T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH MR. YANNY
18 PREPARING HIS OWN DEFENSE OR TALKING TO HIS WITNESSES.
19 IT'S REALLY -- I HATE TO USE THIS EXPRESSION; IT GOES BACK
20 TO MY DAYS IN THE DOMESTIC RELATIONS DEPARTMENT -- IT'S
21 ALMOST LIKE A BEATING-YOUR-WIFE ORDER. BUT IT IS JUSTIFIED
22 IN THIS SITUATION.

23 IT SEEKS ONLY TWO THINGS: TO PRECLUDE HIM
24 FROM BREACHING HIS FIDUCIARY DUTY BY DISCLOSING INFORMATION
25 HE LEARNED DURING HIS EMPLOYMENT; THE SECOND THING IT TALKS
26 ABOUT IS TAKING PART IN ANY ACTIVITY WHICH WOULD VIOLATE
27 HIS FIDUCIARY DUTY OF LOYALTY. THAT'S ALL IT ASKS ABOUT.
28 HE OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO COMPLY WITH THAT.

1 THE REASON I THINK WE'RE ENTITLED TO IT IS
2 THE BACKGROUND AND THE COURSE OF CONDUCT SUBSEQUENTLY SHOWS
3 IN YANNY I AND HIS SUBSEQUENT CONDUCT THAT THAT IS A
4 LIKELIHOOD AND A STRONG POSSIBILITY AND HAS, IN FACT,
5 OCCURRED, ESPECIALLY IN THE AZNARAN CASE. AND BASED ON
6 THAT, THAT'S ALL WE'RE ASKING; IS FOR THAT KIND OF AN ORDER
7 WHICH IS ACTUALLY HIS ONLY OBLIGATION.

8 THE COURT: MR. DRESCHER.

9 MR. DRESCHER: YOUR HONOR, I NEED TO BRING TO YOUR
10 ATTENTION THE FACT THAT -- I DON'T KNOW -- IT JUST STRIKES
11 ME THAT IF PEOPLE REALLY HAVE SOME KIND OF OPPOSITION TO
12 SOMETHING, THEY'D COME OUT AND DO IT.

13 MR. YANNY -- AND FRANKLY, JACK AND I HAVE
14 TALKED ABOUT IT AND WE'RE BOTH SICK OF IT. WE'RE BOTH SICK
15 OF THAT MAN OF ACCUSING US OF ANYTHING CONCERNING THE
16 RECORD IN FRONT OF THIS COURT, BUT PARTICULARLY WHEN HE
17 KEEPS COMING BACK TO THIS MOTION, OF SOME SORT OF UNETHICAL
18 CONDUCT WHICH MR. QUINN AND I PARTICIPATED IN.

19 AND HE GOT THE AZNARANS TO SIGN A DECLARATION
20 TO THAT EFFECT. BUT NOW, THE AZNARANS DON'T THINK SO. THE
21 ISSUE AROSE AGAIN IN FRONT OF JUDGE IDEMAN CONCERNING THE
22 CIRCUMSTANCES OF MR. YANNY ASSUMING THEIR REPRESENTATION,
23 MORE PARTICULARLY, THE AZNARANS FIRING OF FORD GREEN.

24 I HOLD IN MY HAND DECLARATIONS FILED AND
25 SIGNED THE 31ST OF JULY BY THE AZNARANS. NOW, IF THEY WERE
26 TELLING YOU THE TRUTH ABOUT WHO DID WHAT TO WHOM, IT WOULD
27 BE THE SAME STORY THAT THE AZNARANS TOLD IN THE EARLIER
28 DECLARATIONS THAT ARE BEFORE THE COURT, BUT IT'S NOT.

1 NOW, THE AZNARANS, AFTER MR. YANNY'S BEEN
2 BOUNCED OUT FOR DELIBERATELY CONSPIRING TO DERIVE THAT
3 CASE, THE AZNARANS HAVING BEEN CAUGHT IN THE ACT, AND YANNY
4 BOUNCED, HAVE HAD TO GO TO SOME BACK VERSION OF THE TRUTH,
5 SO THIS GREAT UNETHICAL -- THEY BOTH SAY, QUOTE (READING):

6
7 "PREVIOUSLY, I WAS SUFFICIENTLY
8 CONCERNED ABOUT MR. GREEN'S ABILITY TO HANDLE
9 AND MAINTAIN THE TRIAL OF MY CASE; THAT I
10 REPLACED HIM WITH MYSELF IN PRO PER AND THEN
11 SUBSTITUTED JOSEPH YANNY. NOW THAT
12 EXPERIENCED TRIAL COUNSEL HAS BEEN RETAINED,
13 I DO NOT FORESEE ANY FURTHER CHANGES IN
14 REPRESENTATION."

15
16 I'D LIKE TO SUBMIT COPIES OF THOSE BECAUSE,
17 YOUR HONOR, THEY'RE JUST NOT LEVELING WITH YOU. THEY'RE
18 GOING TO SAY WHATEVER THEY CAN SAY TO TRY TO AVOID WHAT'S
19 COMING TO THEM, AND IT'S TIME IT COME TO A STOP, AND BEYOND
20 THAT --

21 MR. YANNY: CAN WE HAVE A COPY?

22 MR. DRESCHER: YES. WE CAN GET YOU A COPY FROM THE
23 BACK.

24 IT ALSO OUGHT TO BE CLEAR THAT IF THERE WERE
25 REALLY SOME SORT OF DEFENSE, YOU WOULDN'T BE CONFRONTED
26 OVER AND OVER AGAIN WITH THE WHALING ABOUT THINGS THAT HAVE
27 NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS CASE.

28 THEY WOULDN'T BE CREATING ISSUES THAT DON'T

1 EXIST TO TRY TO KNOCK THEM DOWN IN THEIR BRIEFS. THEY
2 WOULDN'T HAVE TO SCRAMBLE FOR MR. YANNY DRAGGING UP WHAT
3 HE'S DOING TO MR. RATHBUN AND EMPLOYEES. THEY WOULDN'T
4 HAVE TO TRY TO DECEIVE YOU WITH COMMENTS LIKE JACK QUINN
5 AND I WERE TRYING TO ACT UNETHICALLY.

6 THEY WOULDN'T TRY TO STRIKE YOU WITH YOUR
7 STATEMENT -- MR. YANNY'S STATEMENT TO YOU THE LAST TIME
8 THAT JUDGE IDEMAN THOUGHT SO LITTLE OF THE DISQUALIFICATION
9 MOTION, HE WOULDN'T EVEN LOOK AT IT. WELL, THE FIRST DAY
10 HE WAS BACK, HE NOT ONLY LOOKED AT IT; HE FIXED IT, AND
11 THEY WOULDN'T DECEIVE YOU WITH SOME KIND OF MOTION TO THAT.

12 THEY WOULDN'T TRY TO DECEIVE YOU WITH SOME
13 SORT OF NOBILITY GOING ON HERE, BECAUSE MR. YANNY NEVER HAD
14 TO QUALIFY ABOUT ANYTHING TO DO WITH THESE CLIENTS. HE'S
15 POCKETED 2.2 MILLION. THEY PAID HIM TO BE THEIR LAWYER,
16 AND NOW, HE'S TRYING TO ADD TO THAT, AND HE'S TRYING TO DO
17 IT AT THE EXPENSE OF THOSE CLIENTS, AND THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT
18 WE'RE COMPLAINING HERE ABOUT.

19 MR. VAN SICKLE: THAT EMOTIONAL TIRADE ASIDE, THOSE
20 ARE THINGS THAT, AT BEST, NEED TO BE DETERMINED IF THIS
21 CASE EVER PROCEEDS ON THE MERITS, AND WE DO HAVE YANNY II;
22 OF THOSE THAT WERE SHOT DOWN IN YANNY I.

23 BUT ISSUES SUCH AS WHO'S RIGHT AND WHO'S
24 WRONG; AND JOE HAS HIS INTERPRETATION, THEY HAVE THEIR
25 INTERPRETATION ON HOW THE AZNARANS WOUND UP IN PRO PER.
26 THE BOTTOM LINE WAS THE AZNARANS WOUND UP IN PRO PER WITH
27 ABOUT 1,000 PAGES OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION AND YANNY FELT
28 THE NEED TO FIX IT.

1 BUT IN ANY EVENT, WE GO BACK TO THE BASIC
2 ISSUES WHICH THIS IS A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION. THIS IS NOT
3 A TRIAL ON THE MERITS. AND THEY'RE COMING IN SEEKING A
4 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION THAT THE COURT, I THINK IN THE PAST,
5 HAS SEEN THEM ABUSE.

6 THEY COME IN AND SAY, WHAT'S THE HARM, WHAT'S
7 THE HARM, WHAT'S THE HARM. THEY SEEK A PRELIMINARY
8 INJUNCTION. THEY THEN DEFY -- THEY MAKE IT NOT ONLY
9 AGAINST MR. YANNY, BUT HIS LAWYERS, EVERYBODY THAT WORKS
10 WITH HIM. THEY PUT A PARAGRAPH IN ABOUT EVERYBODY THAT'S
11 ACTING IN CONCERT.

12 THEY MENTION KEN ROSE, A DECLARATION WHICH IS
13 A COMPLETE FABRICATION. THE NEXT THING WE'RE GOING TO SEE,
14 WE'RE GOING TO SEE -- KEN ROSE IS HERE TODAY -- KEN ROSE
15 DEPOSED IN THIS CASE, EVEN THOUGH HE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH
16 IT.

17 YESTERDAY, I SAW ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF CLEAR
18 ABUSE IN THE ROXANNE FRIEND CASE. THEY NOTICED THE
19 DEPOSITIONS OF THE WHITFIELDS. ANOTHER COUNSEL. THEY'RE
20 AT WAR WITH THE PROBLEM AND THEY'RE NOT COMING IN AND
21 MEETING THEIR BURDEN. THERE'S A LOT OF NAME CALLING, A LOT
22 OF EXCITEMENT, BUT THEY'RE COMING IN AND SEEKING A
23 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, AND WE'VE GOT A DEFENSE, AND WE PUT
24 IN THERE FACTUALLY THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN. WHAT HAPPENED?

25 WE WERE IN THE AZNARAN CASE, BRIEFLY. WE'RE
26 OUT. WE HAD A REASON. IT WAS A GOOD REASON. WE NEVER
27 REPRESENTED ARMSTRONG. THAT'S ALL THERE IS.

28 NOW, ALL THIS TALK ABOUT BACK AND FORTH AND

1 THE RATHBUNS IS RIDICULOUS. DECLARATIONS ASIDE, THOSE ARE
2 THINGS THAT THE COURT CAN WEIGH OR THE JURY CAN WEIGH, IF
3 WE DON'T GET THIS THING BOUNCED ON THE PRELIMINARY
4 INJUNCTION.

5 WHERE IS THE BEEF?

6 IT'S NOT THERE.

7 THE COURT: THE COURT, AFTER HEARING ARGUMENT AND
8 READING THE DOCUMENTS OF COUNSEL, DOES THE FOLLOWING:

9 INsofar AS THE TRO IS CONCERNED, THE COURT
10 FINDS THAT IT IS TOO BROAD IN NATURE, THEREFORE, THE COURT
11 WILL DO THE FOLLOWING:

12 THE COURT FINDS THAT THERE IS A LIKELIHOOD
13 THAT THE PLAINTIFFS WILL PREVAIL IN THIS MATTER AGAINST MR.
14 YANNY AND, THEREFORE, AND ALSO, THAT IN LIGHT OF MR.
15 YANNY'S STATEMENT THAT HE DOES NOT REPRESENT ARMSTRONG,
16 THAT HE SHOULD NOT BE, THEREFORE, CONCERNED WITH A
17 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.

18 THE COURT RULES THAT YANNY -- THE COURT NOTES
19 THAT YANNY REPRESENTED THE PLAINTIFFS FOR SEVERAL YEARS AND
20 NOW HAS APPEARED AS COUNSEL FOR THE AZNARANS IN THE FEDERAL
21 COURT AGAINST HIS FORMER CLIENTS, THE PLAINTIFFS, WITHOUT
22 THEIR CONSENT IN VIOLATION -- APPEARS TO BE IN VIOLATION OF
23 BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE 6068(E) AND RULES OF
24 PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT 3-310(D).

25 THE COURT IN ITS STATEMENT OF DECISION IN
26 CASE NO. 690211, THE YANNY ONE CASE, OBSERVED THAT
27 DEFENDANT YANNY MANIFESTED, QUOTE, "READY WILLINGNESS TO
28 DISREGARD LEGAL ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES OWED TO HIS FORMER

1 CLIENT," CLOSED QUOTE.

2 YANNY HAS APPEARED AS COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR
3 THE AZNARANS ON MATTERS SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR TO THOSE FOR
4 WHICH YANNY WAS ENGAGED TO SAFEGUARD FOR HIS CLIENTS THE
5 PLAINTIFFS.

6 THERE IS NO WRITTEN CONSENT BY DEFENDANTS TO
7 DO SO, NOR DOES IT APPEAR THAT PLAINTIFFS WILL EVER
8 CONSENT, AND ON THAT SCORE, YOU WILL SEE PAGES 8855 DAR,
9 8849 IN THE COMPLEX ASBESTOS LITIGATION CASE AS PREVIOUSLY
10 CITED AND IS IN THE POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.

11 THE COURT NOTES IN THE COMPLAINT ALLEGES THAT
12 YANNY REPRESENTS GERALD ARMSTRONG AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS.
13 THIS FACT IS DISPUTED AND WILL BE DETERMINED AT TRIAL.

14 IN THE INTERIM, THE COURT NOTES THAT THE
15 PLAINTIFFS SEEK A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION TO PREVENT YANNY
16 FROM REPRESENTING ARMSTRONG IN ANY ACTION AGAINST THE
17 PLAINTIFFS.

18 YANNY, AN ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF, BROUGHT
19 LEGAL ACTION AGAINST -- EXCUSE ME -- STRIKE THAT.

20 YANNY DENIES THAT HE REPRESENTS ARMSTRONG, A
21 FACT WHICH WILL BE DETERMINED AT TRIAL. THEREFORE, YANNY
22 SHOULD NOT BE CAUSED TO COMPLAIN FOR A PRELIMINARY
23 INJUNCTION THAT PREVENTS HIM FROM REPRESENTING ARMSTRONG.

24 FINALLY, MR. YANNY'S STATEMENT OF THE DILEMMA
25 THAT HE FOUND HIMSELF IN WHEN HE CHOSE TO BECOME OF RECORD
26 FOR THE AZNARANS IN THE FEDERAL COURT, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT
27 WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE FORMER CLIENTS, THAT IT APPEARS
28 TO BE A MATTER SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR TO THOSE FOR WHICH HE

1 REPRESENTED THE CHURCH AGAINST OTHERS, AND ALTHOUGH MR.
2 YANNY INSISTS THAT HE SAW IT HIS DUTY TO BECOME OF RECORD
3 FOR THE AZNARANS, IT APPEARS THAT, AT LEAST FOR THE
4 PURPOSES OF THIS HEARING, THAT MR. YANNY DID VIOLATE THE
5 RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT BY NOT OBTAINING CONSENT --
6 AND I SAY, IT APPEARS TO -- AND THAT'S THE POSTURE THAT I
7 MAKE AT THIS TIME -- THAT IS THE RULING THAT I MAKE AT THIS
8 TIME.

9 THEREFORE, THE COURT FINDS THAT THERE'S A
10 LIKELIHOOD THAT THE PLAINTIFFS WILL PREVAIL IN THIS MATTER,
11 AND THAT THE MONEY DAMAGES ARE NOT ADEQUATE.

12 A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION WILL ISSUE, NARROW
13 IN SCOPE. THAT IS TO SAY, THAT MR. YANNY SHALL NOT
14 REPRESENT THE AZNARANS DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY IN ANY CASE
15 AGAINST PLAINTIFFS, IN ANY CASE IN THIS COUNTY.

16 NEXT: YANNY MAY NOT INITIATE ANY LEGAL
17 PROCEEDINGS FOR AZNARANS AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS WITHIN THE
18 STATE OR FEDERAL COURT OF THIS STATE.

19 NEXT: ANY ACTIONS ALREADY FILED BEFORE JULY
20 31ST, '91 IN WHICH YANNY IS OF COUNSEL FOR AZNARANS SHALL
21 BE SUBJECT TO AN INDIVIDUAL MOTION TO DISQUALIFY IN THAT
22 COUNTY, SHOULD THERE BE ONE.

23 THE POINT IS THAT THIS PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
24 PRECLUDES YANNY FROM INITIATING ANY CASE WHERE HE IS OF
25 COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR THE AZNARANS IN THIS STATE.

26 INSOFAR AS GERALD ARMSTRONG IS CONCERNED, A
27 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION WILL ISSUE THAT YANNY NOT REPRESENT
28 ARMSTRONG DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY IN ANY LEGAL PROCEEDING

1 AGAINST PLAINTIFFS WITHOUT PLAINTIFFS' PRIOR WRITTEN
2 CONSENT OR FURTHER COURT ORDER.

3 THAT YANNY NOT INITIATE ANY LEGAL PROCEEDING
4 IN ANY COURT OF THIS STATE OR IN THE FEDERAL COURT FOR
5 YANNY AGAINST -- FOR ARMSTRONG AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS.

6 AND NEXT: IN ANY ACTION THAT MAY HAVE BEEN
7 FILED PRIOR TO JULY 31ST, '91 BY YANNY IN FAVOR OF
8 ARMSTRONG AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS; THAT THAT MATTER SHALL BE
9 A SUBJECT OF AN INDIVIDUAL MOTION TO DISQUALIFY IN SUCH
10 OTHER COUNTY SHOULD THAT CASE HAVE BEEN FILED.

11 THE COURT HAS NARROWED THE INJUNCTION SO THAT
12 IT PRECLUDES MR. YANNY AND YANNY CORPORATION FROM
13 REPRESENTING THE AZNARANS AS COUNSEL, AND THAT MEANS
14 DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY.

15 WITHOUT ENUMERATING THE MANY INSTANCES WHERE
16 CONDUCT IS ALLOWED, THE GENERAL IMPORT OF THIS PRELIMINARY
17 INJUNCTION IS NOT TO PRECLUDE ASSOCIATION. IT'S NOT TO
18 PRECLUDE EMPLOYMENT. IT'S NOT TO PRECLUDE MR. YANNY'S
19 RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES, IF THERE ARE ANY, AND IT IS NOT AN
20 ATTEMPT BY THIS COURT TO RESTRAIN ASSOCIATION, BUT RATHER,
21 IT'S A LIMITED INJUNCTION THAT PRECLUDES REPRESENTATION OF
22 THESE TWO OR THREE ENTITIES, THE TWO AZNARANS AND MR.
23 ARMSTRONG, AS LAWYERS IN A CASE, OR NOT REPRESENTING HIM AS
24 A LAWYER, AND NOT TO DO IT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, SUCH AS
25 THROUGH ANOTHER LAWYER.

26 HAVING SAID THAT, MR. DRESCHER, A NEW ORDER
27 WILL ISSUE CONSISTENT WITH THE COURT'S COMMENTS, MAKING IT
28 A VERY NARROW, LIMITED ONE, AS I'VE OUTLINED.

1 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS THAT --
2 BEFORE I MAKE A FURTHER ORDER, I WILL POINT
3 OUT THAT JUDGE TORRES WILL THIS DAY SIGN AN ORDER ASSIGNING
4 THIS CASE TO THIS JUDGE WITHOUT FURTHER MOTION TO BE MADE
5 BY EITHER SIDE, AND THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS THAT DEFENDANTS
6 FILE AN ANSWER WITHIN 20 DAYS AND, FURTHER, THAT AN AT
7 ISSUE MUST BE FILED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF TODAY'S DATE.

8 FURTHER, THAT THE TRIAL OF THIS MATTER IS
9 GOING TO BE SET OCTOBER 21ST, 1991 AT 9:00 A.M. IN THIS
10 DEPARTMENT.

11 MR. YANNY: YOUR HONOR --

12 THE COURT: YES.

13 MR. YANNY: -- IF I MIGHT.

14 I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE ORDER AS THE
15 COURT HAS INDICATED DOES NOT AS WELL PRECLUDE ME FROM
16 DEFENDING MYSELF ANYPLACE, SUCH AS IN THE AZNARANS' CASE,
17 WHERE MY NAME HAS BEEN INTERJECTED --

18 THE COURT: FURTHER COMMENT.

19 MR. YANNY: -- BY THESE PEOPLE.

20 THE COURT: FURTHER COMMENT: CONSISTENT WITH ITS
21 RULING IN YANNY I, THE COURT NOW MAKES NO ORDER PRECLUDING
22 OR PREVENTING MR. YANNY FROM BRINGING ANY LEGAL ACTION
23 AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS, SHOULD HE DEEM THAT HE HAS BEEN
24 WRONGED.

25 IT IS NOT AN ORDER THAT PRECLUDES HIM FROM
26 GATHERING EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF HIS CASE AGAINST THE
27 PLAINTIFFS, NOR DOES IT PRECLUDE HIM FROM TALKING TO
28 POTENTIAL WITNESSES FOR HIS CASE, SHOULD THERE BE ONE.

1 I PURPOSEFULLY HAVE NOT SOUGHT TO ENUMERATE
2 ALL THE INSTANCES THAT ARE NOT COVERED, BUT RATHER TO GIVE
3 YOU SOME GENERAL STATEMENTS TO GIVE YOU SOME GUIDELINE.

4 THE COURT HAS NOW SET A TRIAL DATE, WHICH IS
5 A QUICK ONE, BUT THE ISSUES ARE NARROW, AND IT SEEMS TO ME,
6 AS AN OBSERVATION, RATHER THAN A RULING, THAT THE REAL
7 ISSUE IS WHETHER A PERMANENT INJUNCTION SHOULD BE ISSUED AS
8 AGAINST YANNY REPRESENTING THE AZNARANS, AND THE FACTUAL
9 QUESTION WHETHER OR NOT THERE REALLY IS ANY REPRESENTATION
10 OF ARMSTRONG BY YANNY.

11 THE ORDER IS MADE THIS MORNING ON THE PREMISE
12 THAT MR. YANNY DENIES THAT HE REPRESENTS ARMSTRONG, AND IF
13 THAT'S THE CASE, HE'S NOT HARMED IN THE INTERIM BY IT, BUT
14 THE COMMENTS MADE ARE INTENDED TO GIVE SOME INSIGHT THAT I
15 DON'T ANTICIPATE NOR WILL I LOOK TOO KINDLY ON PLAINTIFFS
16 BRINGING DEFENDANT YANNY IN HERE FOR EVERY, LITTLE CLAIMED
17 WRONG, BECAUSE THAT IS NOT THE INTENT.

18 THE INTENT IS TO QUICKLY RESOLVE THIS MATTER,
19 AND IT IS IN THE LAST WORD I HAVE TO SAY IS, AS FAR AS THIS
20 COURT'S CONCERNED, THIS IS NOT A LAWSUIT TO RIGHT MANY
21 WRONGS THAT ARE CLAIMED OR TO RESOLVE THE OBVIOUS DISPUTE
22 AND TO EQUAL THE ANIMOSITY THAT EXISTS, BUT RATHER TO RULE
23 ON THE NARROW QUESTIONS OF WHETHER OR NOT THERE'S A
24 VIOLATION OF RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, AND WHAT, IF
25 ANY, THE COURT SHOULD GIVE TO IT.

26 MR. YANNY: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD ASK WITH RESPECT TO
27 THE MATTER OF THE BOND, I WOULD ASK THAT THERE BE NO BOND
28 POSTED AND THE PLAINTIFFS WAIVE --

1 THE COURT: TO THE EXTENT THAT THERE IS A BOND,
2 THERE WILL BE NO BOND.

3 MR. YANNY: SO AS NOT TO BE PRECLUDED FROM GOING
4 AFTER THE FULL AMOUNT OF DAMAGE SHOULD THERE HAVE BEEN A
5 WRONGFUL ENJOINMENT AT THE REQUEST OF THE PLAINTIFFS.

6 THE COURT: THE REQUEST OF DAMAGES AND SO FORTH WILL
7 BE ADDRESSED TO OCTOBER 21ST.

8 MR. DRESCHER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

9 MR. QUINN: YOUR HONOR, MIGHT I POINT OUT JUST ONE
10 MECHANICAL PROBLEM.

11 THE AZNARANS' TRIAL IS SET FOR OCTOBER, WHICH
12 MR. DRESCHER AND I APPEAR, AND IT'S TO BE FOLLOWED BY THE
13 CORYDON CASE, THE ONLY CASE WE'RE INVOLVED WITH MR. VAN
14 SICKLE, WHICH COMES RIGHT BEYOND BEHIND THAT, SO I JUST
15 THOUGHT WE OUGHT TO WARN YOU ABOUT THE PROBLEM ON THE TRIAL
16 DATE.

17 THE COURT: TO BEGIN WITH, I THOUGHT CORYDON HAD
18 SOMEHOW BEEN RESOLVED OR WAS ON THE VERGE OF BEING
19 RESOLVED, WHICH WOULD ELIMINATE ONE OF THE QUESTIONS. THE
20 OTHER CASE, I'M NOT AWARE OF.

21 BUT FOR NOW, I'M GOING TO DO THE FOLLOWING:

22 I'M GOING TO ADD THAT THERE WILL BE A STATUS
23 CONFERENCE IN THIS CASE OCTOBER 11TH, '91, AT 9:00 A.M. IN
24 THIS DEPARTMENT, AND THAT IS SO THAT THE COURT CAN REVIEW
25 THE POSTURE OF THE OTHER PROCEEDINGS AND MAKE SUCH OTHER
26 ORDERS AS WILL BE REQUIRED.

27 I THINK I'VE SAID ALL THAT I NEED TO SAY,
28 AND, MR. DRESCHER, IF YOU WILL, PREPARE AN ORDER CONSISTENT

1 WITH THE COURT'S COMMENTS.

2 MR. DRESCHER: WE CERTAINLY WILL.

3 THANK YOU.

4 MR. YANNY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

5
6 (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED.)
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT 41

HON. RAYMOND CARDENAS, JUDGE

RELIGIOUS TECHNOLOGY CENTER, A)
CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT RELIGIOUS)
CORPORATION; CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY)
INTERNATIONAL, A CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT)
RELIGIOUS CORPORATION; AND CHURCH OF)
SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, A)
CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT RELIGIOUS)
CORPORATION,)

PLAINTIFFS,)

VS.)

JOSEPH A. YANNY, AN INDIVIDUAL;)
JOSEPH A. YANNY, A PROFESSIONAL LAW)
CORPORATION; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 25,)
INCLUSIVE,)


DEFENDANTS.)

SUPERIOR COURT
CASE NO. BC 033035

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, LINDA STALEY, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY
OF LOS ANGELES, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING PAGES
1 THROUGH 38, INCLUSIVE, COMPRISE A TRUE AND CORRECT
TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED
MATTER REPORTED BY ME ON AUGUST 6, 1991.

DATED THIS 20TH DAY OF AUGUST 1991.


LINDA STALEY, CSR NO. 3359
OFFICIAL REPORTER

envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid in the United States mail at Hollywood, California, addressed as follows:

Ford Greene
711 Sir Francis Drake Blvd.
San Anselmo, CA 94960-1949

If hand service is indicated on the above list, I caused the above-referenced paper to be served by hand.

Executed on August 27, 1991 at Hollywood, California.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lawrence J. ...". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the typed text.